

### REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 4, 2004, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks and amendment have been made in consequence thereof.

Subsequent to entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-6, 8-14, and 16-20 will be pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 10, and 13-15 are rejected. Claims 7, 15, and 16 have been canceled. Claims 7-9, 11, 12, and 16-20 are objected to.

The objection to the specification is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Claim 17 has been amended in accordance with the specification to recite "a portion of said second sleeve has a diameter that is approximately equal to a portion of said first sleeve first diameter, said second sleeve diameter is smaller than a diameter of said first and second sidewall openings." Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

The objection to Claim 8 is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the objections to Claim 8 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 10, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Meyers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,993,918) in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of Claim 7. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329).

Claims 3-6 and 10 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 3-6 and 10 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 3-6 and 10 are likewise patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329).

Claim 16 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 15 and 16 have

been canceled and independent Claim 13 has been amended to include the recitations of Claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329).

Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claim 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicants submit that Claim 14 likewise is patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329).

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 10, and 13-15 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329) and further in view of Gutnik (U.S. Pat. No. 4,815, 193) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been canceled and independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of Claim 7. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329), and further in view of Gutnik.

Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claim 2 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claim 2 is likewise patentable over Meyers et al. in view of United Kingdom Patent 472,329 (UK '329), and further in view of Gutnik.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9, 11, 12, and 16-20 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been canceled and Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of Claim 7. Accordingly, Claim 1 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 8, 9, 11, and 12 depend from independent Claim 1 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 8, 9, 11, and 12 are considered in



13DV-14061  
PATENT

combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 8, 9, 11, and 12 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 has been canceled and Claim 13 has been amended to include the recitations of Claim 16. Accordingly, Claim 14 is submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 13 which is submitted to be in condition for allowance. When the recitations of Claims 17-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicants submit that Claims 17-20 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Reeser III  
Registration No. 45,548  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070